

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

This application is believed to be in condition for allowance because the claims are non-obvious and patentable over the cited references. The following paragraphs provide the justification for this belief. In view of the following reasoning for allowance, the Applicant hereby respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration of the subject patent application.

1. Rejection of Claims 1, 4-6, 9, 11 and 20 Under 35 USC §103(a)

In the Office Action of January 27, 2006, claims 1, 4-6, 9, 11 and 20 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Lee, Pub. No. US 2002/0087521 A1, in view of Thorner et al., US Patent No. 6,463,443 (hereinafter Thorner). The Applicant respectfully traverses this contention of obviousness, and respectfully suggests that the Office Action has misinterpreted the Thorner reference in an attempt to show equivalence to the claimed invention. Specifically, Applicants respectfully suggest that the Office Action has cited particular features of the Thorner reference in a context that is not supported by the Thorner reference. In addition, Applicants respectfully suggest that the Office Action has also mischaracterized one or more elements of the Lee reference.

In particular, with respect to the Lee reference, the Office Action suggests that Lee teaches the claimed element of "identifying at least one person represented by the identified data." Specifically, the Office Action explains that Lee teaches this claimed element because Lee discloses "identifying word or words sequences which represented candidate names..." The Office Action offers page 1, paragraphs [0007], [0012], and [0020] in support of this argument.

However, in stark contrast to the position advanced by the Office Action, it should be clear that Lee does **not** identify "at least one person represented by the identified data" as disclosed by the Applicant.

For example, in paragraph [0007] of the Lee reference, Lee explains that parsing of the electronic documents is used for “identifying **words or word sequences** which represent **candidate names**” (emphasis added). In other words, Lee is merely looking for words in a document that might represent valid personal names, i.e., “candidate names.” Note that merely identifying a word as matching a valid personal name (from a database of possible name values) does **not** identify the person bearing that name.

Similarly, in paragraph [0012] of the Lee reference, Lee explains that “candidate names” are compared “against a database of known name entities and, if the candidate name contains a known name entity or entities, that name is accepted as a personal name and, if the candidate name does not contain a known name entity or entities, the name is either flagged as an invalid personal name or further processed to check its validity.” In other words, In other words, Lee is merely comparing words in a document that are flagged as “candidate names” against a database of possible name values). Clearly, such comparisons do **not** identify the person bearing that name.

Finally, in paragraph [0020] of the Lee reference, lee explains that the claimed system operates by “identifying **words or word sequences** which represent **candidate names**” (emphasis added). In other words, Lee is merely looking for words in a document that might represent valid personal names, i.e., “candidate names.” Note that merely identifying a word as matching a valid personal name (from a database of possible name values) does **not** identify the person bearing that name.

Clearly, paragraphs [0007], [0012], and [0020] of the Lee reference fail completely to support the argument that Lee teaches the claimed element of “identifying at least one person represented by the identified data.” Again, Lee identifies **words or word sequences** as being legitimate names, with respect to a list of legitimate names. Lee does **not** identify any people represented by those names as disclosed and claimed by the Applicants.

Further, with respect to the Thorner reference, the Office Action suggests that “Thorner teaches the claimed **automatically retrieving information** relating to each identified person from at least one electronic database...” The Office Action offers col.4, lines 59-67; col.6, lines 27-39 of the Thorner reference in support of this argument.

However, it should be clear that as previously explained by the Applicants, Thorner performs **manually** initiated searches in response to a **manual** entry of search criteria after the user has **manually** informed the computer that he/she intends to make a database search. In particular, as clearly explained in column 4, lines 39-57 of the Thorner reference:

“A person A at the computer 1 states that he/she intends to make a database search for a person ... First the catalogue 7 sends a menu regarding what kind of data which is already known ... The person A may fill in the known features directly, for instance, via the keypad of the computer.”

Further, it should also be clear that because Thorner requires the user to **manually enter** one or more data elements as search criteria into a “menu” of possible kinds of data (name, address, telephone number, etc.), the computer presumably **waits** for the user to indicate that the user has finished entering data. In other words, the actual search performed by Thorner is also **manually** initiated as the computer will not perform the search until the user is finished entering data. Clearly, this is not an **automatic** retrieval of information as claimed by the Applicants.

Consequently, it should be clear that the Thorner reference does **not** teach “the claimed **automatically retrieving information** relating to each identified person from at least one electronic database...” as suggested by the Office Action.

In fact, it must also be noted that the Office Action offers the Thorner reference in combination with the Lee reference as completely disclosing the Applicants claimed invention. In combining those references, it is not proper to take elements of those references out of the context in which they are presented by the references in order to

construct a hybrid system that is not representative of the proposed combination reference.

In particular, as described above, Lee clearly operates to parse documents to return lists of valid personal names represented either by individual words or by word sequences existing within those documents. Lee does **not** identify the people associated with those names as disclosed and claimed by the Applicants. In various embodiments, these names may be presented to the user, or provided with links back to the document from which the names were extracted. Further, also as described above, Thorner operates to perform **manually** initiated searches in response to a **manual** entry of search criteria after the user has **manually** informed the computer that he/she intends to make a database search.

Consequently, Applicants believe that the proposed Lee-Thorner combination will operate by parsing documents to identify personal names that will then be presented to the user (Lee contribution to the proposed combination). Further, given this list of personal names, the user will then be provided with the opportunity manually initiate searches by selecting one or more names from the list (Thorner contribution to the proposed combination). Therefore, it should be clear that the Lee-Thorner combination proposed by the Office Action fails completely to disclose the Applicants claimed invention. In particular, Lee fails to identify persons as a function of identified data representing that person, while Thorner fails to automatically retrieve data relating to an identified person.

It should be noted that as previously explained by the Applicants, the applicants are claiming a system that automatically parses an electronic document to identify data representing any person. The **identified data** is then used to specifically **identify at least one person represented by the identified data**. The **identity of that person is then used to retrieve information** relating to each identified person from at least one electronic database. These features are **not** disclosed by the proposed Lee-Thorner combination.

While the actual retrieval of information following **manual** initiation of a search and **manual** entry of data delimiting that search may be automatic, this is not

In addition, in the "**Remark**" section of the Office Action, presented on page 13, the Office Action states that the "Applicants asserted that Thorner does not disclose that the search criteria are not automatically derived" (emphasis added).

This is a clear misinterpretation of the Applicants remarks. In particular, in their previous response, entered 31 October, 2005, the Applicants specifically explained the following:

"However, **Thorner teaches that said database searches and subsequent data retrieval are initiated manually by the user** (not initiated automatically as claimed by the Applicant), **and all search criteria are manually entered by the user in advance of beginning the search** (search criteria are not automatically derived as claimed by the Applicant)."

Clearly, Applicants are explaining that Thorner **does** disclose that the search criteria are **not** automatically derived. In fact, as explained above, Thorner **requires** manual entry of the search criteria, and as such, it is clear that the Thorner **does** disclose that the search criteria are **not** automatically derived.

Furthermore, in the "**Remark**" section of the Office Action, presented on page 13, the Office Action states the following:

"Thorner states that a complete information of persons and organizations communication addresses is given automatically if desired, so the search engine sends a menu to the computer client regarding probable subject information to be search, wherein the system automatically connects to a inquired person and then automatically request or search person of the desired interest. Such of system of Thorner provides that the search criteria is automatically derived."

Applicants are unclear as to what the Office Action is attempting to explain in the above cited text. However, as best understood, Applicants believe that the Office Action is suggesting that the Thorner reference presents the user with a menu which provides various information fields that may be filled out by the user for use in performing searches. The Office Action then apparently suggests that this shows that Thorner teaches that the search criteria is "automatically derived."

However, as explained above with respect to column 4, lines 39-57 of the Thorner reference, it is clear that Thorner presents a "menu" that provides various fields. Specifically, Thorner states the following:

"First the catalogue 7 sends a *menu* regarding what kind of data which is already known, such as

- name/names
- permanent summer private address(es) (postal and visiting)
- Telephone number(s)
- facsimile number(s)
- Telex number(s) if relevant
- E-mail-address(es)
- IP-address(es), like Internet-address(es) etc.

The *person A may fill in the known features directly*, for instance via the keypad of the computer." (emphasis added)

Clearly, the "menu" described by Thorner is simply a type of form that allows user entry of data into various fields, including: names, addresses, telephone numbers, etc. It should be clear that providing the user with this type of "menu" fails completely to disclose that "the search criteria is automatically derived" as suggested by the Office Action.

Finally, in the "**Remark**" section of the Office Action, presented on page 14, the Office Action states that "Applicants are reminded that the examiner is entitled to the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims." Applicants agree that the examiner should interpret the claims in the broadest reasonable manner. However, in view of the

preceding discussion, it should be clear that the examiner's interpretation of the both the claims and the cited references is **not** reasonable in view of the cited art.

In order to deem the Applicant's claims unpatentable under 35 USC §103(a), a prima facie case showing obviousness must be made. To make a prima facie case showing obviousness, *all* of the elements of the recited claims must be considered, especially when they are missing from the prior art. If a claimed element is *not* taught in the prior art and has advantages not appreciated by the prior art, then no prima facie case of obviousness exists. The Federal Circuit court has stated that it was an error not to distinguish claims over a combination of prior art references where a material limitation in the claimed system and its purpose was not taught therein (*In Re Fine*, 837 F.2d 107, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)).

Based on the arguments presented above, **neither Lee nor Thorner teach the Applicant's claimed system for automatically retrieving, from at least one electronic database, information relating to each identified person resulting from the automatic parsing of an electronic document.** Accordingly, no prima facie case of obviousness has been established in accordance with the holding of *In Re Fine*. This lack of prima facie showing of obviousness means that rejected claims 1, 4-6, 9, 11 and 20 are patentable under 35 USC §103(a) over Lee in view of Thorner. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 1, and thus the rejection of dependent claims 4-6, 9, 11, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over **Lee** in view of **Thorner**, in view of the non-obviousness of claim 1, as cited below:

"A system for automatically alerting a user to available information comprising using a computing device for:

automatically parsing an electronic document, said electronic document including any of a word processor document, an Internet Web page, a spreadsheet, and any textual and graphical data rendered on a display device, ***to identify data representing any person;***

identifying at least one person represented by the identified data;

automatically retrieving information relating to each identified person from at least one electronic database;

notifying the user that the retrieved information is available; and
using at least a portion of the retrieved information relating to one or more of the identified persons to automatically provide at least one electronic interface for initiating communication with those identified persons.”
(emphasis added)

2. Rejection of Claims 24, 25, 35 and 36 Under 35 USC §103(a)

In the Office Action of January 27, 2006, claims 24, 25, 35 and 36 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Lee, Pub. No. US 2002/0087521 A1, in view of Thorner et al., US Patent No. 6,463,443 (hereinafter Thorner). The Applicant respectfully traverses this contention of obviousness, and respectfully suggests that the Office Action has misinterpreted the Thorner reference in an attempt to show equivalence to the claimed invention. Specifically, Applicants respectfully suggest that the Office Action has cited particular features of the Thorner reference in a context that is not supported by the Thorner reference. In addition, Applicants respectfully suggest that the Office Action has also mischaracterized one or more elements of the Lee reference.

In particular, with respect to the Lee reference, the Office Action suggests that Lee teaches the claimed element of “automatically scanning electronic ***data being rendered on the computer display device*** to identify information within the electronic data that represents at least one person” (emphasis added). The Office Action offers page 1, paragraphs [0005] through [0020], and page 2, paragraphs [0032] to [0033] in support of this argument.

However, the cited paragraphs of the Lee reference (page 1, paragraphs [0005] through [0020], and page 2, paragraphs [0032] to [0033]) specifically recite various methods for scanning or parsing ***text document and similar files***. For example, on page 1, paragraph [0016], Lee explains:

"The electronic file may be for example a text file (such as a .txt file) or an html file. In the later case, and for similarly structured files, the file may be pre-processed to remove mark-up tags."

Clearly, the Office Action is mischaracterizing the alleged ability of the Lee reference to **scan electronic data being rendered on a computer display device**.

In particular, as previously explained by the Applicant, the **Applicant claims a system for automatically scanning electronic data being rendered on a computer display device**. In view of the detailed description provided in the Applicant's specification, it should be clear that this is *not* interpreted to mean that a document is first scanned and then rendered on the display device, but rather, that the **Applicant's claimed system is directly scanning the information being rendered on the display device itself** to identify data representing any person. This embodiment is particularly useful when a document's electronic file is not directly available to a computing device for parsing.

For example, in paragraph [0068] of the Applicant's specification, the Applicant discloses one method in which information being rendered on a display device may be parsed or scanned to identify information representing at least one person. In particular, said paragraph in said specification states:

"This working example automatically interfaces with display rendering routines of a computer system. The display screen of a computer is rendered in response to instructions, i.e., the display input, such as, for example compiled software code, such as a typical computer program, or, interpreted page descriptions such as HTML or similar script. Consequently, this working example essentially parses all information viewable by the user, as well as hidden text or instructions, such as, for example, hidden text embedded in the HTML code of an Internet web page, to find persons. Specifically, the working example is capable of scanning the display input looking for known names, email addresses (using the canonical form of XXX@YYY.ZZZ), phone numbers, etc., or any data that may represent a person, as described above."

Further, it should be noted that the present Office Action again failed to respond to the Applicants prior arguments regarding “***automatically scanning electronic data being rendered on the computer display device to identify information***,” as disclosed and claimed by the Applicants. In particular, the issue regarding scanning data being rendered on a display device was raised in Applicant’s previous Office Action response dated July 20, 2005, but it was not addressed by the Examiner in the subsequent Office Action. Further, this issue was again raised in the Office Action response entered on October 31, 2005, but it was not addressed by the current Office Action. Consequently, since no Office Action has responded in any way to the substance of the Applicants remarks and arguments regarding this claimed element, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of any claims including this element are unsupported by the cited references.

Further, the present Final Office Action has again failed completely to respond to the substance of the Applicants remarks regarding this point (***now presented in three consecutive responses***), and as such, the finality of the rejection of Claim 24, and the claims dependent therefrom is ***premature***. As explained in M.P.E.P. 706.07(d), “If, on request by applicant for reconsideration, the primary examiner finds the ***final rejection to have been premature, he or she should withdraw the finality of the rejection***. The finality of the Office action ***must*** be withdrawn while the application is still pending” (emphasis added). Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the final rejection because the final rejection is clearly premature for the reasons discussed above.

In addition, as discussed above in Section 1 of the present response, the Thorner reference generally teaches database search methods for finding catalogue data associated with persons and/or organizations, e.g., name, postal address, telephone number, fax number, email address and Internet address. However, Thorner ***teaches that said database searches and subsequent data retrieval are initiated manually by the user*** (not initiated automatically as claimed by the Applicant), ***and all search criteria are manually entered by the user in advance of beginning the search*** (search criteria are not automatically derived as claimed by the Applicant). This is reinforced throughout

Thorner including, for example, the statements from the Abstract, column 2: lines 30-32, and column 4: lines 39-57, each recited in Section 1 above.

Consequently, based on the arguments presented above, neither Lee nor Thorner teach the Applicant's claimed computer-implemented process for ***automatically scanning electronic data being rendered on a computer display device***. Additionally, in view of the arguments presented in Section 1, which are incorporated herein by reference for purposes of brevity, neither Lee nor Thorner teach the Applicant's claimed computer-implemented process for automatically retrieving, from at least one electronic database, information relating to each identified person resulting from the automatic scanning of said electronic data.

Accordingly, no prima facie case of obviousness has been established in accordance with the holding of *In Re Fine*. This lack of prima facie showing of obviousness means that rejected claims 24, 25, 35 and 36 are patentable under 35 USC §103(a) over Lee in view of Thorner. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 24, and thus the rejection of dependent claims 25, 35 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over ***Lee*** in view of ***Thorner***, in view of the non-obviousness of claim 24, as cited below:

A computer-implemented process for automatically providing information on a computer display device, comprising:

automatically scanning electronic data being rendered on the computer display device to identify information within the electronic data that represents at least one person;

identifying each person represented by the identified information;

automatically retrieving information relating to each identified person from at least one electronic database;

providing an alert for indicating that the retrieved information is available; and

using at least a portion of the retrieved information relating to one or more of the identified persons to automatically provide a user interface for initiating communication with those identified persons via at least one electronic communication access point. (emphasis added)

3. Rejection of Claim 2 Under 35 USC §103(a)

The aforementioned Office Action of January 27, 2006 rejected dependent claim 2 under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Lee in view of Thorner and further in view of Srinivasan, US Patent No. 6,717,936. The Applicant respectfully traverses this contention of obviousness.

More particularly, based on the arguments presented in Sections 1 and 2 above and the Examiner's statements regarding Srinivasan, **neither Lee, Thorner nor Srinivasan teach the Applicant's claimed system for automatically retrieving, from at least one electronic database, information relating to each identified person resulting from the automatic parsing of an electronic document.** Accordingly, no prima facie case of obviousness has been established in accordance with the holding of In Re Fine. This lack of prima facie showing of obviousness means that rejected claim 2 is patentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Lee in view of Thorner and further in view of Srinivasan. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this claim be reconsidered based on the non-obvious claim language as exemplified in claim 1 and recited in Section 1 above.

4. Rejection of Claims 7 and 8 Under 35 USC §103(a)

The aforementioned Office Action of January 27, 2006 rejected dependent claims 7 and 8 under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Lee in view of Thorner and further in view of Dimitrova, US Patent No. 6,363,380. The Applicant respectfully traverses this contention of obviousness.

More particularly, based on the arguments presented in Section 1 above and the Examiner's statements regarding Dimitrova, **neither Lee, Thorner nor Dimitrova teach**

the Applicant's claimed system for automatically retrieving, from at least one electronic database, information relating to each identified person resulting from the automatic parsing of an electronic document. Accordingly, no prima facie case of obviousness has been established in accordance with the holding of In Re Fine. This lack of prima facie showing of obviousness means that rejected claims 7 and 8 are patentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Lee in view of Thorner and further in view of Dimitrova. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these claims be reconsidered based on the non-obvious claim language as exemplified in claim 1 and recited in Section 1 above.

5. Rejection of Claims 10 and 12 Under 35 USC §103(a)

The aforementioned Office Action of January 27, 2006 rejected dependent claims 10 and 12 under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Lee in view of Thorner and further in view of Sorensen, US Patent No. 6,628,729. The Applicant respectfully traverses this contention of obviousness.

More particularly, based on the arguments presented in Section 1 above and the Examiner's statements regarding Sorensen, **neither Lee, Thorner nor Sorensen teach the Applicant's claimed system for automatically retrieving, from at least one electronic database, information relating to each identified person resulting from the automatic parsing of an electronic document.** Accordingly, no prima facie case of obviousness has been established in accordance with the holding of In Re Fine. This lack of prima facie showing of obviousness means that rejected claims 10 and 12 are patentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Lee in view of Thorner and further in view of Sorensen. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these claims be reconsidered based on the non-obvious claim language as exemplified in claim 1 and recited in Section 1 above.

6. Rejection of Claims 13-15 Under 35 USC §103(a)

The aforementioned Office Action of January 27, 2006 rejected dependent claims 13-15 under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Lee in view of Thorner and further in

view of Yamakita, US Patent No. 6,272,490. The Applicant respectfully traverses this contention of obviousness.

More particularly, based on the arguments presented in Section 1 above and the Examiner's statements regarding Yamakita, **neither Lee, Thorner nor Yamakita teach the Applicant's claimed system for automatically retrieving, from at least one electronic database, information relating to each identified person resulting from the automatic parsing of an electronic document.** Accordingly, no prima facie case of obviousness has been established in accordance with the holding of *In Re Fine*. This lack of prima facie showing of obviousness means that rejected claims 13-15 are patentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Lee in view of Thorner and further in view of Yamakita. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these claims be reconsidered based on the non-obvious claim language as exemplified in claim 1 and recited in Section 1 above.

7. **Rejection of Claims 26-30 Under 35 USC §103(a)**

The aforementioned Office Action of January 27, 2006 rejected dependent claims 26-30 under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Lee in view of Thorner and further in view of Yamakita, US Patent No. 6,272,490. The Applicant respectfully traverses this contention of obviousness.

More particularly, based on the arguments presented in Sections 1 and 2 above and the Examiner's statements regarding Yamakita, **neither Lee, Thorner nor Yamakita teach the Applicant's claimed computer-implemented process for automatically scanning electronic data being rendered on a computer display device.** Additionally, **neither Lee, Thorner nor Yamakita teach the Applicant's claimed computer-implemented process for automatically retrieving, from at least one electronic database, information relating to each identified person resulting from the automatic scanning of said electronic data.** Accordingly, no prima facie case of obviousness has been established in accordance with the holding of *In Re Fine*. This lack of prima facie showing of obviousness means that rejected claims 26-30 are patentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Lee in view of Thorner and further in view of Yamakita. Accordingly, it is

respectfully requested that these claims be reconsidered based on the non-obvious claim language as exemplified in claim 24 and recited in Section 2 above.

8. Rejection of Claims 37, 38, 40-45 and 50 Under 35 USC §103(a)

The aforementioned Office Action of January 27, 2006 rejected claims 37, 38, 40-45 and 50 under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Lee in view of Thorner and further in view of Yamakita, US Patent No. 6,272,490. The Applicant respectfully traverses this contention of obviousness.

More particularly, similar to the discussion in Sections 1 and 2 above, **Lee teaches methods for parsing only electronic files. Lee does not teach methods for parsing or detecting any information in an electronic document rendered on a computer display device** (as claimed by the Applicant). This is reinforced by the Lee statement on page 1, paragraph [0016], as recited in Section 2 above.

In contrast, the **Applicant claims a computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions for automatically detecting any information in an electronic document rendered on a computer display device.** In view of the detailed description provided in the Applicant's specification, it should be clear that this is *not* interpreted to mean that a document is first scanned and then rendered on the display device, but rather, that the **Applicant's claimed system is directly detecting the information being rendered on the display device itself** to identify any information that represents a person. This embodiment is particularly useful when a document's electronic file is not directly available to a computing device for parsing. In paragraph [0068] of the Applicant's specification, recited in Section 2 above, the Applicant discloses one method in which information being rendered on a display device may be parsed or scanned to identify information representing at least one person.

As discussed in Section 1 above, Thorner teaches database search methods for finding catalogue data associated with persons and/or organizations. However, **Thorner teaches that said database searches and subsequent data retrieval are initiated**

manually by the user (not initiated automatically as claimed by the Applicant), **and all search criteria are manually entered by the user in advance of beginning the search** (search criteria are not automatically derived as claimed by the Applicant). This is reinforced throughout Thorner including, for example, the statements from the Abstract, column 2: lines 30-32, and column 4: lines 39-57, each of which are recited in Section 1 above.

Yamakita teaches an apparatus whereby, for a designated electronic document, for all “proper noun” words in the document, or for words that are not “general ideas” and “appear frequently” in the document, a network search is performed for data related to said words, an address links to said network data are added into the document via a pointers to a link destination table, and the words are highlighted in the document. **Nowhere in Yamakita is reference made to documents rendered on a computer display device, or to methods or means for detecting the desired words in the document on said device.**

Based on these arguments, **neither Lee, Thorner nor Yamakita teach the Applicant’s claimed computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions for automatically detecting information in an electronic document rendered on a computer display device.** Additionally, **neither Lee, Thorner nor Yamakita teach the Applicant’s claimed computer executable instructions for automatically retrieving data related to each person identified in said document rendered on said computer display device.** Accordingly, no prima facie case of obviousness has been established in accordance with the holding of In Re Fine. This lack of prima facie showing of obviousness means that rejected claims 37, 38, 40-45 and 50 are patentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Lee in view of Thorner and further in view of Yamakita. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 37, and thus the rejection of dependent claims 38, 40-45 and 50 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over **Lee** in view of **Thorner**, and in further view of **Yamakita** in view of the non-obviousness of claim 37, as cited below:

“A computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions for dynamically modifying **an electronic document rendered on a computer display device**, said computer executable instructions comprising:

automatically **detecting any information in the electronic document** that represents at least one person;
automatically ***identifying each person based on a comparison of the detected information to data in at least one electronic database; automatically retrieving data related to each identified person*** from at least one electronic database;

dynamically modifying the electronic document by changing the appearance of the electronic document for alerting a user that data related to each identified person has been retrieved.” (emphasis added)

9. Rejection of Claim 39 Under 35 USC §103(a)

The aforementioned Office Action of January 27, 2006 rejected dependent claim 39 under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Lee in view of Thorner in view of Yamakita and further in view of Dimitrova. The Applicant respectfully traverses this contention of obviousness.

More particularly, based on the arguments presented in Section 8 above and the Examiner's statements regarding Dimitrova, **neither Lee, Thorner, Yamakita nor Dimitrova teach the Applicant's claimed computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions for automatically detecting information in an electronic document rendered on a computer display device**. Additionally, **neither Lee, Thorner, Yamakita nor Dimitrova teach the Applicant's claimed computer executable instructions for automatically retrieving data related to each person identified in said document rendered on said computer display device**. Accordingly, no prima facie case of obviousness has been established in accordance with the holding of In Re Fine. This lack of prima facie showing of obviousness means that rejected claim 39

is patentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Lee in view of Thorner in view of Yamakita and further in view of Dimitrova. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this claim be reconsidered based on the non-obvious claim language as exemplified in claim 37 and recited in Section 8 above.

10. Rejection of Claims 16-19 and 21-23 Under 35 USC §103(a)

The aforementioned Office Action of January 27, 2006 rejected dependent claims 16-19 and 21-23 under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Lee in view of Thorner and further in view of Appelman et al., US Patent No. 6,539,421 (hereinafter Appelman). The Applicant respectfully traverses this contention of obviousness.

More particularly, based on the arguments presented in Section 1 above and the Examiner's statements regarding Appelman, **neither Lee, Thorner nor Appelman teach the Applicant's claimed system for automatically retrieving, from at least one electronic database, information relating to each identified person resulting from the automatic parsing of an electronic document.** Accordingly, no prima facie case of obviousness has been established in accordance with the holding of In Re Fine. This lack of prima facie showing of obviousness means that rejected claims 16-19 and 21-23 are patentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Lee in view of Thorner and further in view of Appelman. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these claims be reconsidered based on the non-obvious claim language as exemplified in claim 1 and recited in Section 1 above.

11. Rejection of Claims 31-34 Under 35 USC §103(a)

The aforementioned Office Action of January 27, 2006 rejected dependent claims 31-34 under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Lee in view of Thorner and further in view of Appelman et al., US Patent No. 6,539,421. The Applicant respectfully traverses this contention of obviousness.

More particularly, based on the arguments presented in Section 2 above and the Examiner's statements regarding Appelman, **neither Lee, Thorner nor Appelman teach**

the Applicant's claimed computer-implemented process for automatically scanning electronic data being rendered on a computer display device. Additionally, **neither Lee, Thorner nor Appelman teach the Applicant's claimed computer-implemented process for automatically retrieving information, from at least one electronic database, relating to each identified person resulting from the automatic scanning of said electronic data.** Accordingly, no prima facie case of obviousness has been established in accordance with the holding of *In Re Fine*. This lack of prima facie showing of obviousness means that rejected claims 31-34 are patentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Lee in view of Thorner and further in view of Appelman. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these claims be reconsidered based on the non-obvious claim language as exemplified in claim 24 and recited in Section 2 above.

12. Rejection of Claims 46-49 Under 35 USC §103(a)

The aforementioned Office Action of January 27, 2006 rejected dependent claims 46-49 under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Lee in view of Thorner in view of Yamakita and further in view of Appelman. The Applicant respectfully traverses this contention of obviousness.

More particularly, based on the arguments presented in Section 8 above and the Examiner's statements regarding Appelman, **neither Lee, Thorner, Yamakita nor Appelman teach the Applicant's claimed computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions for automatically detecting information in an electronic document rendered on a computer display device.** Additionally, **neither Lee, Thorner, Yamakita nor Appelman teach the Applicant's claimed computer executable instructions for automatically retrieving data related to each person identified in said document rendered on said computer display device.** Accordingly, no prima facie case of obviousness has been established in accordance with the holding of *In Re Fine*. This lack of prima facie showing of obviousness means that rejected claims 46-49 are patentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Lee in view of Thorner in view of Yamakita and further in view of Appelman. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that

these claims be reconsidered based on the non-obvious claim language as exemplified in claim 37 and recited in section 8 above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 2 and 4-50 are in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of claims 1-2 and 4-50 and to pass this application to issue. Additionally, in an effort to further the prosecution of the subject application, the Applicant kindly invites the Examiner to telephone the Applicant's attorney at (805) 278-8855 if the Examiner has any questions or concerns.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark A. Watson
Registration No. 41,370
Attorney for Applicant

Lyon & Harr
300 Esplanade Drive, Suite 800
Oxnard, California 93036
(805) 278-8855